



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,868	03/30/2004	Han-Che Wang	IEIP0010USA	2867
27765 7590 04/04/2007 NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			EXAMINER WILLIS, RANDAL L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/04/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 04/04/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com
Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com
mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/708,868	WANG, HAN-CHE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Randal L. Willis	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,5-10,12 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4 and 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to application No. 10/708868 filed March 30, 2004. Claims 1-13 are pending and have been examined.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 2-4 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 8-10, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Findlay (US 6,262,718).

Apropos claim 1, Findlay teaches:

A computer system, comprising:

- a screen for displaying images (CRT 10, Fig 1);

- a central processing unit (CPU) for controlling the operation of the computer system (CPU located in Host Computer 180, Fig 1);

- an on-screen display (OSD) circuit electrically connected to the CPU and the screen (Display Processor 140, Fig 1), for controlling the screen to display a plurality of test marks (Test marks 260 and 270, Fig. 2) according to a plurality of predetermined coordinate values (predetermined to be top left and bottom right of screen, Col 5 lines 37);

- a touch panel (170, Fig 1) installed parallel to the display face of the screen, for generating a plurality of test sensing signals according to positions at which it is triggered (Col 5 lines 40-42); and

- a control circuit (Touch Processor 120, Fig 1) electrically connected to the touch panel and the CPU, for calibrating the coordinate values converted by the control circuit from the sensing signals generated by triggering the touch panel, according to the predetermined coordinate values and the test sensing signals (Col 5 lines 43-60).

Apropos claim 8, Findlay teaches:

The computer system of claim 1, wherein the control circuit (120, Fig 1) converts the test sensing signals into a plurality of test coordinate values (Col 5 lines 40-44), and calibrates the coordinate values converted by the control circuit from the sensing signals generated by triggering the touch panel, according to the predetermined coordinate values and the test coordinate values (Col 5 lines 44-50).

Apropos claim 9, Findlay teaches:

The computer system of claim 1, wherein the control circuit outputs test display data to the OSD circuit (touch processor 120 has in its memory 160 microcode that initiates the displaying of the calibration image Col 5 lines 25-34), and the OSD circuit generates the predetermined coordinate values according to the test display data (Host 180 initiates targets 260 and 270 to be displayed Col 5 lines 34-36, but display processor 140 generates the actual values to drive the display Col 4 lines 25-30).

Apropos claim 10, Findlay teaches:

A method for calibrating coordinate values (calibration routine Col 5 line 24) generated by a touch panel, comprising:

(a) utilizing a plurality of predetermined coordinate values (marks 260 and 270, Fig 2 predetermined to be top left and bottom right Col 5 lines 37) by means of the on-screen display (OSD) to control a screen to display a plurality of test marks;

(b) generating a plurality of test coordinate values according to positions at which a touch panel is triggered (Col 5 lines 38-42);

(c) calibrating the coordinate values of sensing signals generated by triggering the touch panel according to the predetermined coordinate values and the test coordinate values (Col 5 lines 45-55).

Apropos claim 12, Findlay teaches:

The method of claim 10, wherein Step (c) utilizes the interpolation method (Col 5 lines 50-55) to calibrate the coordinate values generated by triggering the touch panel.

Apropos claim 13, Findlay teaches:

The method of claim 10, wherein Step (a) further comprises a step of receiving video drive signals corresponding to a predetermined image in order to determine the resolution of the screen, and controlling the predetermined coordinate values according to the resolution of the screen (Col 4 lines 23-26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Findlay (6,262,718) in view of West (5,831,597).

Apropos claim 5, Findlay teaches the control circuit utilizing a mouse interface or serial link to communicate with the CPU (Col 3 lines 64-65).

However fails to explicitly teach the serial link being a universal serial bus USB.

In the same field of endeavor West teaches the use of a USB connection to connect an input device with a computer (Col 7 lines 50-53).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to use a USB as the communication link between the touch processor and the CPU of Findlay's invention in order to allow the touch panel and other peripheral devices to individually communicate to the CPU (Col 7 lines 57-60).

9. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Findlay (6,262,718) in view of Tajrir (4,752,655).

Apropos claims 6 and 7, Findlay teaches the touch screen (170, Fig 1) being implemented by conventionally techniques (Col 3 lines 51-52).

However Findlay fails to explicitly teach those techniques including electro-resistive and electromagnetic touch panels.

In the same field of coordinate input devices, Tajrir teaches that both resistive (Col 1 lines 43-63) and electromagnetic touch panels (Col 1 lines 30-37) are conventional input devices.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use either resistive or electromagnetic touch panels as the touch screen on Findlay, since the implication of either has no effect on the calibration method taught by Findlay as a matter of design choice.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Mussler (4,710,758) for teaching a similar calibration method.
- b. Akebi (6,353,434) for teaching a similar calibration method.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randal L. Willis whose telephone number is (571) 270-1461. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30am to 5:00pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RLW

AMR A. AWAD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
